

REMARKS

Claim Objections

The Office objected that claims 32 and 44 are dependent on canceled claim 31. Those objections are obviated by amendments herein. Claim 32 is canceled. Claim 44 is now dependent upon claim 27.

35 USC § 103

The Office rejected claims all previously pending claims as being obvious over come combination of Carroll, Moskowitz et al., Auerbach et al., Kip et al., Turner et al., and Roth et al., and Schoenian et al. Those rejections are thought to be overcome by amendments herein. Among other things, claims 27 and 28 each recite a "separate" power storage component. Carroll specifically teaches against a separate power storage component, contemplating instead that the capacitance of the entire circuit is sufficient to power the chip. (Col. 8, lines 1-15). Applicant is not challenging functionality of Carroll's devices, but instead has appreciated an aspect that was either not contemplated by Carroll, or was contemplated and rejected; namely that using a separate power storage component is desirable to provide the tag with greater output power.

With respect to independent claim 75 and its dependencies, none of the prior art teaches, suggests or motivates one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a tag that utilizes the second antenna to modulate and reflect the incoming wave to send the output data to a receiver.

Respectfully submitted,
Rutan & Tucker, LLP

Dated: August 23, 2004

By: 

Robert D. Fish
Reg. No. 33,880

Attorneys for Applicant(s)
Post Office Box 1950

509/099999-4000
275159.01 a08/23/04

Fax: (714) 546-9035
Customer No. 34284

This Page Blank (uspto)